



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,149	04/23/2001	Ranjit Sahota	004572.P002	6058

7590 09/01/2005  
Sang Hui Michael Kim  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

SRIVASTAVA, VIVEK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2617

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/841,149

Applicant(s)

SAHOTA, RANJIT

Examiner

Vivek Srivastava

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) in the previous office action have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Mao et al (US 6,459,427).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

**Claims 1 – 3, 5, 7 – 10, 12, 14 – 18, 20 – 22, 24, 25 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mao et al (US 6,459,427).**

**Regarding claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 24 and 27** Mao discloses a system and method for integrating television content with internet content. Mao discloses a headend (fig 1) which creates an integrated video data stream by automatically integrating interactive

web content received or downloaded from the world wide web 110 (see fig 1) with TV broadcast content received from analog TV source 30 or digital TV source 40 via receiver 60 (see fig 1). Mao further discloses transmitting the integrated content to a client set-top terminal 150 for display on a TV (see fig 1).

**Regarding claims 2, 9, 18 and 22**, Mao discloses the additional web based information is a web page about a TV commercial (see col 2 lines 65 – 67). Necessarily, the web page is advertising content.

**Regarding claims 3, 10 and 25** Mao discloses the user can displaying the associated web page with the TV commercial (see col 2 lines 65 – 67) and thus discloses linking the interactive content with the TV broadcast.

**Regarding claim 5 and 12**, Mao discloses transmitting the TV broadcast with web pages (see fig 1 and col. 4 lines 20 – 25). It is noted that Mao does not disclose modifying the interactive content and the TV broadcast content.

**Regarding claims 7 and 14**, Mao discloses providing customized and targeted integrated content (see col 2 lines 40 – 45).

**Regarding claim 16**, Mao discloses the user can access additional information about a commercial (see col 2 lines 63 – 65) and thus discloses the claimed limitation.

**Regarding claims 17 and 21**, Mao discloses the claimed set-top box 150 (see fig. 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 4, 11, 13, 19, 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mao (US 6,459,427).**

**Regarding claims 4, 11 and 26** Mao fails to disclose displaying the integrated content to allow a user to interact with the interactive content.

Official Notice is taken it would have been well known to integrate a first content with a second interactive content for the benefit of enhancing a user's viewing experience. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of enhancing a user's viewing experience.

**Regarding claims 6 and 13**, Mao fails to disclose the claimed advertising banner. Official Notice is taken it would have been well known that displaying an advertising banner both provides displaying additional information while minimizing obstruction of the primary video content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of providing a viewer with additional information while minimizing obstructing viewing of the primary video content.

**Regarding claims 19 and 23**, Mao discloses customizing the interactive content for specific users but fails to disclose customizing the interactive content for a specific market, group or geographic region.

Official Notice is taken targeting commercials for a specific market, group or geographic region efficiently provides targeted advertising to a larger group of people. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mao to include the claimed limitation for the benefit of providing targeted advertising to a larger group of people thus providing a more efficient system for targeting ads.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Field et al (US 6,018,764) – One-way broadcast of internet content

Zigmond et al (US 6,571,392) – Integrating internet content with TV content

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Srivastava whose telephone number is (571) 272-7304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 9 am to 6 pm.

Art Unit: 2617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272 – 7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Vs  
8/30/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vivek Srivastava', written in a cursive style.

**VIVEK SRIVASTAVA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**